arXiv:1402.6052v1 [hep-ph] 25 Feb 2014

Comprehensive Study of $\overline{B}^0 \to \overset{(-)}{K}^0 K^{\mp}\pi^{\pm}$ Decays in the Factorization Approach

Ying Li*

Department of Physics, Yantai University, Yantai 264-005, China

February 26, 2014

Abstract

Using the factorization approach, we investigate the $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ and $\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+$ decays individually including the resonant and nonresonant contributions. Under the flavor SU(3) symmetry, we obtain the total branching fraction $BR[\overline{B}^0 \to (\overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^- + K^0 K^-\pi^+)] = (7.17^{+0.50+1.97+0.08}_{-0.53-1.42-0.07}) \times 10^{-6}$, which is in agreement with the recent measurements of BaBar and LHCb within errors. For the decay $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$, the nonresonant background and $a_0^+(1450)$ pole in the current-induced process provide large contribtuion, the latter of which has not been included in previous studies. On the contrary, the decay $\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+$ is dominated by the nonresonant background and the offshell ρ^+ pole. When the flavor SU(3) symmetry breaking and the final state interactions are considered under two different scenarios, the results can also accommodate the experimental data with large uncertainties. Moreover, the direct CP asymmetry of $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ is found to be sensitive to the matrix element of scalar density. These predictions could be further tested in the LHCb experiment or Super-b factory in future.

*Email:liying@ytu.edu.cn

Over past few years, more attention has been paid to charmless three-body B decays both experimentally and theoretically, because by studying them one is allowed to extract the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa angles, probe the sources of CP violation and even search for the possible effects of new physics beyond the standard model. In addition, the three-body decays of B meson can help us study two-body decays involving vector or scalar mesons, because most vector and scalar mesons are unstable and decay to two pseudoscalar particles. On the experimental side, some three-body decays of B meson have been measured by Belle, BaBar and LHCb experiment [1]. The theoretical activity has run in parallel, and certain works, within different approaches such as factorization approach [2, 3, 4], diagrammatic approach combined with SU(3) symmetry[5, 6] and perturbative QCD approach [7], have been advocated to study the $B \to PPP$ decays.

Recently, LHCb collaboration updated the previous measurements of branching fractions of $B \to KK\pi$ [8] and the latest result $BR[\overline{B}^0 \to (\overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^- + K^0 K^-\pi^+)] = (6.4\pm0.9\pm0.4\pm0.3)\times10^{-6}$ [9] is consistent with the BaBar's result $(6.4 \pm 1.0 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-6}$ released four years ago [10]. Theoretically, these two decays have been analyzed by Cheng *et al.* recently in [4] based on the factorization approach. Without eliminating the interference effect between these two decays, the predicted branching fraction $(6.2^{+2.7}_{-1.7}) \times 10^{-6}$ was in good agreement with above data. Very recently, these results have been updated in [11], and the branching fraction is $(4.7^{+2.8}_{-1.8}) \times 10^{-6}$ after correcting the typos in the computer code.

In this work, we would like to reexamine in detail the decays $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ and $\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+$ in the factorization approach for the following reasons: (i) As pionted out in [11], there are some bugs in the computer code of [4], and the contributions of ρ and $a_0(1450)$ poles have not been included. Although the contributions for the aforementioned poles have been added in the decay $\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+$ in [11], their contributions have been omitted in the decay $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$. Our results in the following show that ρ^+ pole dominates the resonant contribution. (ii) The results of three-body decays $B^- \to K^+K^-K^-$ [4] and $\overline{B}^0_s \to K_S K^\mp\pi^\pm$ [12] show that flavor SU(3) symmetry violations and final state rescattering may be large in three-body charmless B decays. In order to describe these effects, an extra strong phase δ [4] or a phenomenological parameter β [12] has been introduced. In the present work, we wish to examine the effects of SU(3) asymmetry and final state interactions in the decays $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ and $\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+$ individually. (iii) The branching fractions and CP asymmetries of nonresonant backgrounds have not been given in previous studies, and we will discuss them in detail here. (iv) We will discuss the resonant contributions explicitly, which were incorrect in [4] and were absent in [11]. (v) The formulas, such as the individual amplitudes and parameterized form factors will be given explicitly.

In the factorization approach, the amplitude is usually splitted into three distinct factorizable terms, the current-induced process with a meson emission, the transition process and the annihilation process, though the factorization in B meson three-body decay has not been proven. In the practical calculations, the contributions from the annihilations are assumed to be power suppressed and ignored. For the calculations of the nonresonant contributions to $\langle KK(\pi)|(\bar{q}b)_{V-A}|B\rangle$ in the current-induced processes, we extend the results obtained in [4] where most experimental results were successfully reproduced with heavy meson chiral perturbative theory (HMChPT)[13] that combines the heavy quark symmetry and the chiral Lagrangian approach, although applica-

bility of this framework in all kinematics region is still controversial [14]. In the B meson decays, heavy quark symmetry is expected to be even better, while the chiral perturbative theory might be less reliable due to large energies of light mesons in the final state. It is accepted that the HMChPT is valid at small recoil momentum, which means that the HMChPT could be applied in a small fraction of the whole Dalitz plot; nevertheless, it is not justified to apply it to a certain kinematic region and then generalize it to the region beyond its validity. To overcome this shortcoming, Cheng *et al* proposed in [4] that the momentum dependence of nonresonant amplitudes is in an exponential form $\exp[-\alpha_{\rm NR} p_B\cdot(p_i+p_j)]$ so that the HMChPT results are recovered in the soft meson limit, and the mode independence parameter $\alpha_{\rm NR}$ can be fixed from the decay of $B^-\to\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-$, since it is dominated by the nonresonan contribution.

The effective Hamiltonian for the process $b\to d\bar{q}q$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\rm eff} &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{p=u,c} V_{pb}V_{pd}^*\Big\{a_1\delta_{pu}(\bar{u}b)_{V-A}\otimes(\bar{d}u)_{V-A}+a_2\delta_{pu}(\bar{d}b)_{V-A}\otimes(\bar{u}u)_{V-A}\\
&+a_3(\bar{d}b)_{V-A}\otimes\sum_q(\bar{q}q)_{V-A}+a_4^p\sum_q(\bar{q}b)_{V-A}\otimes(\bar{d}q)_{V-A}+a_5(\bar{d}b)_{V-A}\otimes\sum_q(\bar{q}q)_{V+A}\\
&-2a_6^p\sum_q(\bar{q}b)_{S-P}\otimes(\bar{d}q)_{S+P}+a_7(\bar{d}b)_{V-A}\otimes\sum_q\frac{3}{2}e_q(\bar{q}q)_{V+A}-2a_8^p\sum_q(\bar{q}b)_{S-P}\otimes\frac{3}{2}e_q(\bar{d}q)_{S+P}\\
&+a_9(\bar{d}b)_{V-A}\otimes\sum_q\frac{3}{2}e_q(\bar{q}q)_{V-A}+a_{10}^p\sum_q(\bar{q}b)_{V-A}\otimes\frac{3}{2}e_q(\bar{d}q)_{V-A}\Big\},
\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

where $(\bar{q}_1q_2)_{V\pm A}=\bar{q}_1\gamma_\mu(1\pm\gamma_5)q_2$ and $(\bar{q}_1q_2)_{S\pm P}=\bar{q}_1(1\pm\gamma_5)q_2$. The corresponding effective Wilson coefficients at the renormalization scale $\mu=2.1$ GeV are listed as [4]

$$\begin{aligned}
&a_1\approx 0.99+0.037i,\quad a_2\approx 0.19-0.11i,\quad a_3\approx -0.002+0.004i,\quad a_5\approx 0.0054-0.005i,\\
&a_4^u\approx -0.03-0.02i,\quad a_4^c\approx -0.04-0.008i,\quad a_6^u\approx -0.06-0.02i,\quad a_6^c\approx -0.06-0.006i,\\
&a_7\approx 0.54\times10^{-4}i,\quad a_8^u\approx(4.5-0.5i)\times10^{-4},\quad a_8^c\approx(4.4-0.3i)\times10^{-4},\\
&a_9\approx -0.010-0.0002i,\quad a_{10}^u\approx(-58.3+86.1i)\times10^{-5},\quad a_{10}^c\approx(-60.3+88.8i)\times10^{-5},
\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

where the strong phases arise from vertex corrections and penguin contractions.

According to the effective Hamiltonian, the factorable amplitudes for the $\overline{B}^0\to K^0K^-\pi^+$ and

$\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ can be respectively read

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A(\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-) \\
= \; & \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{p=u,c} V_{pb}V_{pd}^* \Big\{ \langle K^+\overline{K}^0|(\bar{u}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle\langle\pi^-|(\bar{d}u)_{V-A}|0\rangle \left[a_1\delta_{pu} + a_4^p + a_{10}^p - (a_6^p + a_8^p)r_\chi^\pi\right] \\
& + \langle\overline{K}^0|(\bar{s}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle\langle K^+\pi^-|(\bar{d}s)_{V-A}|0\rangle \Big[a_4^p - \frac{1}{2}a_{10}^p\Big] \\
& + \langle\overline{K}^0|\bar{s}b|\overline{B}^0\rangle\langle K^+\pi^-|\bar{d}s|0\rangle \Big[- 2a_6^p + a_8^p\Big] \\
& + \langle\overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-|(\bar{u}u)_{V-A}|0\rangle\langle 0|(\bar{d}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle \Big[a_2\delta_{pu} + a_3 + a_9\Big] \\
& + \langle\overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-|(\bar{d}d)_{V-A}|0\rangle\langle 0|(\bar{d}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle \Big[a_3 + a_4^p - \frac{1}{2}a_9 - \frac{1}{2}a_{10}^p\Big] \\
& + \langle\overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-|(\bar{s}s)_{V-A}|0\rangle\langle 0|(\bar{d}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle \Big[a_3 - \frac{1}{2}a_9\Big] \\
& + \langle\overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-|\bar{d}(1+\gamma_5)d|0\rangle\langle 0|\bar{d}\gamma_5 b|\overline{B}^0\rangle \Big[2a_6^p - a_8^p\Big] \Big\}, \qquad (3)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A(\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+) \\
= \; & \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{p=u,c} V_{pb}V_{pd}^* \Big\{ \langle K^-\pi^+|(\bar{s}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle\langle K^0|(\bar{d}s)_{V-A}|0\rangle \Big[a_4^p - \frac{1}{2}a_{10}^p - (a_6^p - \frac{1}{2}a_8^p)r_\chi^K\Big] \\
& + \langle\pi^+|(\bar{u}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle\langle K^- K^0|(\bar{d}u)_{V-A}|0\rangle \Big[a_1\delta_{pu} + a_4^p + a_{10}^p\Big] \\
& + \langle\pi^+|\bar{u}b|\overline{B}^0\rangle\langle K^- K^0|\bar{d}u|0\rangle \Big[- 2a_6^p - 2a_8^p\Big] \\
& + \langle K^0 K^-\pi^+|(\bar{u}u)_{V-A}|0\rangle\langle 0|(\bar{d}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle \Big[a_2\delta_{pu} + a_3 + a_9\Big] \\
& + \langle K^0 K^-\pi^+|(\bar{d}d)_{V-A}|0\rangle\langle 0|(\bar{d}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle \Big[a_3 + a_4^p - \frac{1}{2}a_9 - \frac{1}{2}a_{10}^p\Big] \\
& + \langle K^0 K^-\pi^+|(\bar{s}s)_{V-A}|0\rangle\langle 0|(\bar{d}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle \Big[a_3 - \frac{1}{2}a_9\Big] \\
& + \langle K^0 K^-\pi^+|\bar{d}(1+\gamma_5)d|0\rangle\langle 0|\bar{d}\gamma_5 b|\overline{B}^0\rangle \Big[2a_6^p - a_8^p\Big] \Big\}. \qquad (4)
\end{aligned}
$$

In each amplitude, the last four terms arising from the annihilation contributions will be ignored in the following since they are power suppressed and also α_s suppressed.

As mentioned before, in order to study the nonresonant background of the matrix element $\langle M_1(p_1)M_2(p_2)|(\bar{d}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle$, where the meson M_1 involves the spectator quark $\bar{d}$, we shall use the HMChPT and generalize the results obtained previously in calculating the decay $B^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^-$ in [4]. We then obtain the matrix element, for example $\langle\overline{K}^0(p_1)K^+(p_2)|(\bar{u}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle$, in the general form

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \langle\overline{K}^0(p_1)K^+(p_2)|(\bar{u}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle \\
& = ir(p_B - p_1 - p_2)_\mu + i\omega_+(p_2+p_1)_\mu + i\omega_-(p_2-p_1)_\mu + h\,\epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}p_B^\nu(p_2+p_1)^\alpha(p_2-p_1)^\beta. \qquad (5)
\end{aligned}
$$

The form factors $\omega_\pm$ and r have been evaluated within the HMChPT and given by

$$\omega_+ = -\frac{g}{f_\pi^2}\frac{f_{B^*}m_{B^*}\sqrt{m_B m_{B^*}}}{s_{23}-m_{B^*}^2}\left[1-\frac{(p_B-p_1)\cdot p_1}{m_{B^*}^2}\right]+\frac{f_B}{2f_\pi^2}, \quad (6)$$

$$\omega_- = \frac{g}{f_\pi^2}\frac{f_{B^*}m_{B^*}\sqrt{m_B m_{B^*}}}{s_{23}-m_{B^*}^2}\left[1+\frac{(p_B-p_1)\cdot p_1}{m_{B^*}^2}\right], \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} r = {} & \frac{f_B}{2f_\pi^2}-\frac{f_B}{f_\pi^2}\frac{p_B\cdot(p_2-p_1)}{(p_B-p_1-p_2)^2-m_B^2}+\frac{2gf_{B^*}}{f_\pi^2}\sqrt{\frac{m_B}{m_{B^*}}}\frac{(p_B-p_1)\cdot p_1}{s_{23}-m_{B^*}^2} \\ & -\frac{4g^2f_B}{f_\pi^2}\frac{m_B m_{B^*}}{(p_B-p_1-p_2)^2-m_B^2}\frac{p_1\cdot p_2-p_1\cdot(p_B-p_1)\,p_2\cdot(p_B-p_1)/m_{B^*}^2}{s_{23}-m_{B^*}^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $s_{ij}\equiv(p_i+p_j)^2$. The heavy-flavor independent strong coupling g has been extracted from the D^{*+} decay width, $g=-0.59\pm0.01\pm0.07$. Together with the aforementioned exponential form, we obtain the nonresonant amplitude of current-induced process as

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle K^+\overline{K}^0|(\bar{u}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle\langle\pi^-|(\bar{d}u)_{V-A}|0\rangle^{\rm NR} \\ & = -\frac{f_\pi}{2}\left[2m_3^2 r+(m_B^2-s_{12}-m_3^2)\omega_+ +(s_{23}-s_{13}-m_2^2+m_1^2)\omega_-\right]\, e^{-\alpha_{\rm NR}p_B\cdot(p_1+p_2)}e^{i\phi_{12}}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and the unknown strong phase ϕ_{12} will be set to zero for simplicity. Also, can we obtain the expression of $\langle K^-\pi^+|(\bar{s}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle\langle K^0|(\bar{d}s)_{V-A}|0\rangle^{\rm NR}$, the similar expression as Eqs. (6-9).

For the resonant contribution of the current-induced process, the scalar $a_0^+(1450)$ and vector ρ^+ contribute to the matrix element $\langle K^+\overline{K}^0|(\bar{u}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle$, which can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle K^+\overline{K}^0|(\bar{u}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle^R\langle\pi^-|(\bar{d}u)_{V-A}|0\rangle \\ = {} & -f_\pi\frac{g^{\rho^{*+}\to K^+\overline{K}^0}}{s_{23}-m_\rho^2+im_\rho\Gamma_\rho}\left\{(s_{13}-s_{12})\left[m_\rho A_0^{B\rho}(q^2)+\frac{A_2^{B\rho}(q^2)}{2(m_B+m_\rho)}(s_{23}-m_\rho^2)\right]\right\} \\ & +f_\pi\frac{g^{a_0^+(1450)\to K^+\overline{K}^0}}{s_{23}-m_{a_0(1450)}^2+im_{a_0(1450)}\Gamma_{a_0(1450)}}\Big[(m_B^2-m_{a_0(1450)}^2)F_0^{Ba_0(1450)}(q^2) \\ & +(m_{a_0(1450)}^2-s_{23})F_1^{Ba_0(1450)}(q^2)\Big]. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Here the resonant effects are described in terms of the usual Breit-Wigner formalism. Similarly, the matrix element $\langle K^-\pi^+|(\bar{s}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle$ receives contributions of vector meson $\overline{K}^{*0}$ and scalar $\overline{K}_0^{*0}(1430)$, and the expression is given as

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle K^-(p_2)\pi^+(p_1)|(\bar{s}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle^R\ \langle K^0(p_3)|(\bar{d}s)_{V-A}|0\rangle \\ = {} & -f_K\frac{g^{K^*\to K^-\pi^+}}{s_{12}-m_{K^*}^2+im_{K^*}\Gamma_{K^*}}\left\{\left[s_{13}-s_{23}+\frac{(m_B^2-m_K^2)(m_K^2-m_\pi^2)}{m_{K^*}^2}\right]\left[m_{K^*}A_0^{BK^*}(q^2)\right.\right. \\ & \left.+\frac{A_2^{BK^*}(q^2)}{2(m_B+m_{K^*})}(s_{12}-m_{K^*}^2)\right]+\left(m_K^2-m_\pi^2\right)\left(1-\frac{s_{12}}{m_{K^*}^2}\right)\left[m_{K^*}A_0^{BK^*}(q^2)\right. \\ & \left.\left.-(m_B+m_{K^*})A_0^{BK^*}(q^2)+\frac{A_2^{BK^*}(q^2)}{2(m_B+m_{K^*})}(s_{12}-m_{K^*}^2)\right]\right\} \\ & +f_K\frac{g^{K_0^*\to K^-\pi^+}}{s_{12}-m_{K_0^*}^2+im_{K_0^*}\Gamma_{K_0^*}}\Big[(m_B^2-m_{K_0^*}^2)F_0^{BK_0^*}(q^2)+(m_{K_0^*}^2-s_{12})F_1^{BK_0^*}(q^2)\Big]. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Now, we shall evaluate the transition processes. The matrix element $\langle K^+(p_2)\pi^-(p_3)|(\bar{d}s)_{V-A}|0\rangle$ can be parameterized as:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\overline{K}^0(p_1)|(\bar{s}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle\langle K^+(p_2)\pi^-(p_3)|(\bar{d}s)_{V-A}|0\rangle \\
= \; & -F_1^{BK}(s_{23})F_1^{K\pi}(s_{23})\left[s_{13}-s_{12}-\frac{(m_B^2-m_K^2)(m_K^2-m_\pi^2)}{s_{23}}\right] \\
& -F_0^{BK}(s_{23})F_0^{K\pi}(s_{23})\frac{(m_B^2-m_K^2)(m_K^2-m_\pi^2)}{s_{23}}. \qquad (12)
\end{aligned}$$

A recent detailed analysis of $B^-\to K^-\pi^+\pi^-$ decay in [4] indicates that the nonresonant contribution (weak form factor $F^{K\pi}(q^2)$) plays negligible role, so it can be ignored safely. The contributions from vector and scalar poles to the form factors have the expressions as:

$$F_1^{K\pi,R}(s) = \frac{m_{K^*}f_{K^*}g^{K^*\to K\pi}}{m_{K^*}^2-s-im_{K^*}\Gamma_{K^*}}, \qquad (13)$$

$$F_0^{K\pi,R}(s) = \frac{f_{K_0^*}g^{K_0^*\to K\pi}}{m_{K_0^*}^2-s-im_{K_0^*}\Gamma_{K_{0i}^*}}\frac{s}{m_K^2-m_\pi^2}-\frac{m_{K^*}f_{K_i^*}g^{K^*\to K\pi}}{m_{K^*}^2-s-im_{K^*}\Gamma_{K^*}}\Big[-1+\frac{s}{m_{K^*}^2}\Big]. \qquad (14)$$

Note that for the scalar meson, the scale-dependent scalar decay constant $\bar{f}_S$ and the vector decay constant f_S are defined by

$$\langle S|\bar{q}_2q_1|0\rangle = m_S\bar{f}_S, \;\; \langle S(p)|\bar{q}_2\gamma_\mu q_1|0\rangle = f_S p_\mu. \qquad (15)$$

The two decay constants are related by the equation of motion

$$\mu_S f_S = \bar{f}_S, \qquad \text{with} \;\; \mu_S = \frac{m_S}{m_2(\mu)-m_1(\mu)}, \qquad (16)$$

where m_2 and m_1 are the running current quark masses and m_S is the scalar meson mass.

For the term $\langle\pi^+|(\bar{u}b)_{V-A}|\overline{B}^0\rangle\langle K^-K^0|(\bar{d}u)_{V-A}|0\rangle$, the contributions are not only from nonresonant contribution $\langle K^-K^0|(\bar{d}u)_{V-A}|0\rangle$ that is related to $\langle K^-K^+|(\bar{u}u)_{V-A}|0\rangle$ via flavor SU(3) symmetry, but also from the offshell vector meson ρ^-. The expression of the nonresonant background and its inner functions are refereed to [4], and the formulae of contribution from resonant particles are similar to Eqs.(12-14).

We also need to specify the amplitudes induced from the scalar densities. With the equation of the motion, we are led to, for example,

$$\langle\overline{K}^0(p_1)|\bar{s}b|\overline{B}^0(p_B) = \frac{m_B^2-m_K^2}{m_b-m_s}F_0^{BK}(s_{23}). \qquad (17)$$

The matrix element $\langle K^+\pi^-|\bar{d}s|0\rangle$ receives resonant and nonresonant contributions:

$$\langle K^+(p_2)\pi^-(p_3)|\bar{d}s|0\rangle = \frac{m_{K_0^*}\bar{f}_{K_0^*}g^{K_0^*\to K^+\pi^-}}{m_{K_0^*}^2-s_{23}-im_{K_0^*}\Gamma_{K_0^*}} + \langle K^+(p_2)\pi^-(p_3)|\bar{s}d|0\rangle^{NR}. \qquad (18)$$

The unknown scalar density $\langle K^+\pi^-|\bar{d}s|0\rangle^{NR}$ is related to $\langle K^+K^-|\bar{s}s|0\rangle$ via the SU(3) symmetry, e.g.

$$\langle K^+(p_2)\pi^-(p_3)|\bar{d}s|0\rangle^{NR} = \langle K^+(p_2)K^-(p_3)|\bar{s}s|0\rangle^{NR} = f_s^{NR}(s_{23}), \tag{19}$$

with the expression as

$$f_s^{NR} = \frac{v}{3}(3F_{NR} + 2F'_{NR}) + \sigma_{\rm NR}e^{-\alpha s_{23}} \text{ and } v = \frac{m_{K^+}^2}{m_u + m_s} = \frac{m_K^2 - m_\pi^2}{m_s - m_d}. \tag{20}$$

The functions $F_{NR}^{(\prime)}(s)$ is given by

$$F_{NR}^{(\prime)}(s_{23}) = \left(\frac{x_1^{(\prime)}}{s_{23}} + \frac{x_2^{(\prime)}}{s_{23}^2}\right)\left[\ln\left(\frac{s_{23}}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}\right)\right]^{-1}, \tag{21}$$

with $\tilde{\Lambda} \approx 0.3$ GeV, $x_1 = -3.26$ GeV$^2, x_2 = 5.02$ GeV$^4, x_1' = 0.47$ GeV^2 and $x_2' = 0$. For the unknown parameter $\sigma_{\rm NR}$, we firstly adopt the value fitted from $B \to KKK$ decays, $\sigma_{\rm NR} = e^{i\pi/4}\left(3.39^{+0.18}_{-0.21}\right)$ GeV , which is called scenario-1 (S1). However, in [4], it is found that the predicted $A_{CP}(B^- \to K^-\pi^+\pi^-)$ and $A_{CP}(B^- \to K^+K^-\pi^-)$ with the flavor SU(3) symmetry are wrong in signs confronting the corresponding experimental data, which implies that flavor SU(3) symmetry violation and the final states rescattering might be important. To pick up these kinds of the contributions, two phenomenological approaches have been adopted. In [4], an extra strong phase δ has been introduced and its value was fixed to be π by the CP asymmetries of $B \to KK\pi$ and $B \to K\pi\pi$, and the expression is given by

$$\langle K^+(p_2)\pi^-(p_3)|\bar{d}s|0\rangle^{\rm NR} \approx \frac{v}{3}(3F_{\rm NR} + 2F'_{\rm NR}) + \sigma_{\rm NR}e^{-\alpha s_{23}}e^{i\pi}\left(1 - 4\frac{m_K^2 - m_\pi^2}{s_{23}}\right). \tag{22}$$

In [12], a phenomenological coefficient $\beta = 0.7 \pm 0.2$ has been proposed to describe these effects, by which the experimental data of $B_s \to K_sK^\pm\pi^\mp$ can be reproduced [1]. For convenience, we name above two scenarios as scenario-2 (S2) and scenario-3 (S3).

For the decay mode $\overline{B}^0 \to K^0K^-\pi^+$, the contribution of $\langle K^0K^-|\bar{d}u|0\rangle$ arising from nonresonant background is similar to $\langle K^+K^-|\bar{s}s|0\rangle$ according to the SU(3) symmetry. In principle, the flavor $SU(3)$ asymmetry should be included, however previous studies show that its effect is small enough to be ignored. Together with the resonant contribution of $a_0^-(1450)$, we are led to

$$\langle K^-(p_2)K^0(p_3)|\bar{d}u|0\rangle = \frac{m_{a_0(1450)}\bar{f}_{a_0(1450)}g^{a_0(1450)\to K^-K^0}}{m_{a_0(1450)}^2 - s_{23} - im_{a_0(1450)}\Gamma_{a_0(1450)}} + \frac{v}{3}(3F_{NR} + 2F'_{NR}) + \sigma_{\rm NR}e^{-\alpha s_{23}}. \tag{23}$$

In the numerical calculation of the branching fractions we follow the discussions of the input parameters given in [4]. In Table.1, we present the resonant and nonresonant contributions to the branching fractions of the $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0K^+\pi^-$ and $\overline{B}^0 \to K^0K^-\pi^+$ decays individually under

[1] The experimental datas of $A_{CP}(B^- \to K^-\pi^+\pi^-)$, $A_{CP}(B^- \to K^+K^-\pi^-)$ and $B_s \to K_sK^\pm\pi^\mp$ cannot be explained under above scenarios simultaneously.

Table 1: Predicted branching fractions (in units of 10^{-6}) of resonant and nonresonant (NR) contributions to $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ and $K^0K^-\pi^+$ under S1.

$\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$		$\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+$	
$K^{*0}\overline{K}^0$	$0.24^{+0.00+0.04+0.01}_{-0.00-0.04-0.01}$	$\overline{K}^{*0}K^0$	$0.05^{+0.00+0.11+0.00}_{-0.00-0.04-0.00}$
$K_0^{*0}(1430)\overline{K}^0$	$0.94^{+0.00+0.19+0.03}_{-0.00-0.17-0.02}$	$\overline{K}_0^{*0}(1430)K^0$	$0.02^{+0.00+0.06+0.00}_{-0.00-0.02-0.00}$
$a_0^+(1450)\pi^-$	$2.04^{+0.00+0.54+0.02}_{-0.00-0.44-0.01}$	$a_0^-(1450)\pi^+$	$0.20^{+0.00+0.06+0.01}_{-0.00-0.05-0.01}$
$\rho^{*+}(1450)\pi^-$	$0.29^{+0.00+0.06+0.00}_{-0.00-0.06-0.01}$	$\rho^{*-}(1450)\pi^+$	$0.48^{+0.00+0.12+0.01}_{-0.00-0.11-0.01}$
NR	$2.71^{+0.57+0.64+0.04}_{-0.64-0.37-0.04}$	NR	$0.34^{+0.01+0.14+0.01}_{-0.01-0.11-0.01}$
Total	$6.35^{+0.49+1.59+0.06}_{-0.52-1.18-0.06}$	Total	$0.82^{+0.01+0.38+0.02}_{-0.01-0.24-0.01}$

Table 2: The nonresonant and total branching fraction of $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ under S2 and S3.

	NR	Total
S1	$2.72^{+0.60+0.64+0.03}_{-0.67-0.36-0.03}$	$5.83^{+0.51+1.49+0.04}_{-0.55-1.08-0.04}$
S2	$2.18^{+0.58+0.85+0.03}_{-0.65-0.29-0.03}$	$5.58^{+0.49+1.94+0.04}_{-0.53-1.24-0.05}$

S1. We also give the nonresonant and total branching fractions of $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ under S2 and S3 in Table.2. In above two tables, the first errors are from the uncertainties in the parameter $\alpha_{\rm NR}$ which governs the momentum dependence of the nonresonant amplitude. The second ones arise from the strange quark mass m_s, the form factors, the nonresonant parameter $\sigma_{\rm NR}$ and the flavor $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking. And the last uncertainties are induced by the unitarity angle γ. Noted that the ignored uncertainties arising from the power corrections such as annihilations and hard-scattering corrections may be sizable, but the estimation of them is beyond the scope of the current work.

From Tables.1 and 2, we get the branching fractions of $\overline{B}^0 \to (\overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^- + K^0K^-\pi^+)$ under different scenarios, as given

$$S1: \begin{cases} BR[\overline{B}^0 \to (\overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^- + K^0K^-\pi^+)]_{\rm NR} = (3.05^{+0.58+0.78+0.05}_{-0.65-0.48-0.05}) \times 10^{-6} \\ BR[\overline{B}^0 \to (\overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^- + K^0K^-\pi^+)]_{\rm Total} = (7.17^{+0.50+1.97+0.08}_{-0.53-1.42-0.07}) \times 10^{-6} \end{cases}; \quad (24)$$

$$S2: \begin{cases} BR[\overline{B}^0 \to (\overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^- + K^0K^-\pi^+)]_{\rm NR} = (3.06^{+0.61+0.78+0.04}_{-0.68-0.47-0.04}) \times 10^{-6} \\ BR[\overline{B}^0 \to (\overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^- + K^0K^-\pi^+)]_{\rm Total} = (6.65^{+0.52+1.87+0.06}_{-0.56-1.32-0.05}) \times 10^{-6} \end{cases}; \quad (25)$$

$$S3: \begin{cases} BR[\overline{B}^0 \to (\overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^- + K^0K^-\pi^+)]_{\rm NR} = (2.52^{+0.59+0.99+0.04}_{-0.66-0.40-0.04}) \times 10^{-6} \\ BR[\overline{B}^0 \to (\overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^- + K^0K^-\pi^+)]_{\rm Total} = (6.40^{+0.50+2.32+0.06}_{-0.54-1.48-0.06}) \times 10^{-6} \end{cases}. \quad (26)$$

Obviously, the total branching fractions are consistent with current experimental data well within large uncertainties, thus it is hard for us to discard anyone of them with current data. Noted that the large differences among the nonresonant contribution will help us to discriminate them,

but unfortunately this contribution has not been measured till now. Because of some bugs in the computer code for Ref. [4], our results differ with them. Moreover, the total branching faction is much larger than those in [11] as they had missed the contributions of ρ and $a_0(1450)$ poles in decay $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$, though the branching fractions of $\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+$ are identical. For comparison, we also calculate the branching fractions of $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ and $\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+$ without contribution of the ρ and $a_0(1450)$ poles under S2, and the results is given as:

$$BR(\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-) = (3.98^{+0.59+0.95+0.03}_{-0.64-0.60-0.03}) \times 10^{-6}; \quad (27)$$

$$BR(\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+) = (0.38^{+0.01+0.27+0.01}_{-0.01-0.15-0.01}) \times 10^{-6}, \quad (28)$$

and the branching fraction of $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ is in agreement with the prediction in [11].

It is obvious from Table.1 that the decay $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ is dominated by the nonresonant contribution and $a_0^+(1450)$ pole, which are of order 42.7% and 32.1%, respectively. As for the nonresonant background, the current-induced process accounts about 62% due to the large wilson coefficient a_1, and the effect from the penguin suppressed scalar density is about 38%. For the decay $\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+$, it is found that the offshell resonance ρ^+ pole plays the predominate role, though the decay $\rho^+ \to K^+ K^0$ is kinematically not allowed. In these decays, the resonants $K^{*\pm}$ and $K_0^{*\pm}(1430)$ are absent because the quasi two-body decays $\overline{B}^0 \to K^{*\pm} K^{\mp}$ and $\overline{B}^0 \to K_0^{*\pm}(1430) K^{\mp}$ can proceed only via the pure annihilation diagrams and they are power suppressed. In addition, the scalar $K_0^{*0}(1430)$ and the vector K^{*0} poles can only be produced by penguins, which leads to the smaller ratios comparing to the other contributions. The above discussions about the resonant and nonresonant contributions are also exhibited in the Dalitz-plot shown in Fig. 1.



Figure 1: Dalitz-plot distributions of $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ (left panel) and $\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+$ (right panel) dacays. The CP averaged differential rates are in units of 10^{-6} GeV^{-4}.

Because both $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ and $\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+$ decays have tree and penguin contributions, their CP asymmetries might be sizable. In term of the definition of direct CP violation, for

example,

$$A_{CP} = \frac{BR(\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-) - BR(B^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+)}{BR(\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-) + BR(B^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+)}, \tag{29}$$

we investigate the CP asymmetries of these two decays under different scenarios, and present the results in Table. 3. Note that under S2, owing to an extra strong phase $\delta = \pi$, the sign of CP asymmetry for $\overline{B} \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ differs from the other two cases. If both nonresonant and total CP asymmetries could be studied by LHCb, it will be very interesting to test which scenario is preferable.

Table 3: Predicted CP asymmetry (%) of resonant and nonresonant (NR) contributions to $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ and $K^0 K^-\pi^+$.

	$\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$			$\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+$
	S1	S2	S3	S1
NR	$32.5^{+0.0+2.5+0.1}_{-2.4-5.3-0.1}$	$-25.8^{+2.0+1.7+0.1}_{-2.7-1.1-0.1}$	$29.8^{+1.7+4.7+0.1}_{-1.9-7.2-0.1}$	$-11.3^{+0.4+1.2+0.1}_{-0.6-1.1-0.1}$
Total	$14.6^{+3.1+2.7+0.1}_{-5.3-3.3-0.1}$	$-16.9^{+1.7+1.5+0.1}_{-2.2-1.0-0.1}$	$12.8^{+2.7+3.8+0.1}_{-4.7-3.9-0.1}$	$-13.3^{+0.1+0.3+0.1}_{-0.1-0.6-0.1}$

To summarize, we have quantitatively analyzed the resonant and nonresonant contributions to the $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ and $\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+$ decays in the factorization approach. Including the resonant and nonresonant contributions, the total branching fraction $BR[\overline{B}^0 \to (\overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^- + K^0 K^-\pi^+)] = (7.17^{+0.50+1.97+0.08}_{-0.53-1.42-0.07}) \times 10^{-6}$ agrees with the recent measurements of BaBar and LHCb within errors, and the branching fraction of $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$ is much larger than that of $\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+$. For the decay $\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+\pi^-$, the nonresonant background and $a_0^+(1450)$ pole in the current-induced process play important roles. On the contrary, the decay $\overline{B}^0 \to K^0 K^-\pi^+$ is dominated by the nonresonant background and the offshell ρ^+ pole. When the flavor SU(3) asymmetries and the final state interactions are involved under different scenarios, the total branching fractions can also accommodate the experimental data with large uncertainties, but there are the sizable differences among the nonresonant contributions and CP asymmetries. These predictions of CP asymmetries could be further tested in the LHCb experiment or Super-b factory in future.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Hai-Yang Cheng, Chun-Khiang Chua, Wei Wang and Zhi-Tian Zou for valuable discussions and comments. This work is supported by the National Science Foundation (Grants No. 11175151 and No. 11235005), and the Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University (NCET) by Ministry of Education of P. R. China (Grant No. NCET-13-0991).

References

[1] Y. Amhis *et al.* [Heavy Flavor Averaging Group Collaboration], arXiv:1207.1158 [hep-ex]; and online update at http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag.

[2] N. G. Deshpande, G. Eilam, X. -G. He and J. Trampetic, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 5354 (1995) [hep-ph/9503273]; S. Fajfer, R. J. Oakes and T. N. Pham, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 054029 (1999) [hep-ph/9812313]; B. Bajc, S. Fajfer, R. J. Oakes, T. N. Pham and S. Prelovsek, Phys. Lett. B **447**, 313 (1999) [hep-ph/9809262]; S. Fajfer, T. -N. Pham and A. Prapotnik, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 034033 (2004) [hep-ph/0405065].

[3] H. -Y. Cheng and K. -C. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 054015 (2002) [hep-ph/0205133]; H. -Y. Cheng, C. -K. Chua and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 014006 (2005) [hep-ph/0502235]; H. -Y. Cheng, C. -K. Chua and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 094003 (2005) [hep-ph/0506268]; H. -Y. Cheng, C. -K. Chua and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 094006 (2007) [arXiv:0704.1049 [hep-ph]].

[4] H. -Y. Cheng and C. -K. Chua, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 114014 (2013) [arXiv:1308.5139 [hep-ph]] and references therein.

[5] M. Ciuchini, M. Pierini and L. Silvestrini, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 051301 (2006) [hep-ph/0601233]; M. Gronau, D. Pirjol, A. Soni and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 014002 (2007) [hep-ph/0608243]; N. R. -L. Lorier, M. Imbeault and D. London, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 034040 (2011) [arXiv:1011.4972 [hep-ph]].

[6] B. Bhattacharya, M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Lett. B **726**, 337 (2013) [arXiv:1306.2625 [hep-ph]]; D. Xu, G. -N. Li and X. -G. He, arXiv:1307.7186 [hep-ph]; D. Xu, G. -N. Li and X. -G. He, Phys. Lett. B **728**, 579 (2014) [arXiv:1311.3714 [hep-ph]].;B. Bhattacharya, M. Gronau, M. Imbeault, D. London and J. L. Rosner, arXiv:1402.2909 [hep-ph].

[7] C. -H. Chen and H. -n. Li, Phys. Lett. B **561**, 258 (2003) [hep-ph/0209043]; W. -F. Wang, H. -C. Hu, H. -n. Li and C. -D. L, arXiv:1402.5280 [hep-ph].

[8] [LHCb Collaboration], LHCb-CONF-2012-023.

[9] R.Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], JHEP **1310**, 143 (2013) [arXiv:1307.7648 [hep-ex]].

[10] P. del Amo Sanchez *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **82**, 031101 (2010) [arXiv:1003.0640 [hep-ex]].

[11] H. -Y. Cheng and C. -K. Chua, arXiv:1401.5514 [hep-ph].

[12] Y. Li, arXiv:1401.5948 [hep-ph].

[13] T. -M. Yan *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 1148 (1992) [Erratum-ibid. D **55**, 5851 (1997)]; M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 2188 (1992); G. Burdman and J. F. Donoghue, Phys. Lett. B **280**, 287 (1992); C. L. Y. Lee, M. Lu and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 5040 (1992).

[14] U. -G. Meißner and W. Wang, arXiv:1312.3087 [hep-ph].